

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,570	02/16/2006	Herbert Lee Marko	2701-1-003PCT/US	6476
23565 KLAUBER &	7590 01/17/2008		EXAMINER	
411 HACKENS	SACK AVENUĖ	,	ROSENBAUM, MARK	
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3725	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		<u> </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/568,570	MARKO, HERBERT LEE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Rosenbaum	3725			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f t, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 N	lovember 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
· · · · ·	,				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 and 23-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	drawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. tion is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 21-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11/15/07.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 11/15/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no search burden in examining the two Groups together. This is not found persuasive because there is no requirement for the examiner to search the product subclasses for the process.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Double Patenting

Applicant is advised that should claim 23 be found allowable, claim 24 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 4,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 3725

applicant regards as the invention. The 'such' phrases in these claims are indefinite as it is not clear what is being positively claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20,23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell. Column 5, line 25 through column 6, line 38 appear to show the claimed processes of the independent claims except for the particular temperatures claimed. However, these temperatures would have been obvious modifications by one skilled in the art once the basic process was known in order to have the processes result in the desired products. Also, the particular materials would have been obvious modifications based on the desired product.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 571-272-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Rosenbaum Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

MR